REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-17, 20-26, 29, 34, 36-48 are pending in the Application, of which claims 1, 24, 25, 26, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 47 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 6-13, 15, 20-26, 29, 34, 36-40 and 42-48 have been amended to better claim the invention. Claims 2, 5, 30-33 and 35 have been previously canceled. Claims 18, 19, 27 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter was added.

Applicants respectfully urge that all of the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance.

I. Summary of Rejections

In the Office Action:

claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 18-19, 23-31 and 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,877,138 to Fitzpatrick et al. (hereafter "Fitzpatrick") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,753 to Budinsky et al. (hereafter "Budinsky");

claims 7 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,070,006 to Iriuchijima (hereafter "Iriuchijima");

claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,092 to Dhond (hereafter "Dhond");

claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,949 to Shudo et al. (hereafter "Shudo");

claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,964 to Zink et al. (hereafter "Zink") and in further view of Budinsky;

claims 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,386,568 to Wold et al. (hereafter "Wold") and in further view of Budinsky;

claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132964 by Santori (hereafter "Santori");

claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132964 by Singh (hereafter "Singh"); and

claims 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069400 by Miloushev et al. (hereafter "Miloushev") in view of Budinsky.

These rejections are discussed below.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 18-19, 23 and 30-31

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 18-19, 23 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 5, 18, 19, 30 and 31 have been canceled. Therefore, the above § 103 rejection of claims 5, 18, 19, 30 and 31 is moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 1: *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter.*

Fitzpatrick generally discusses modifying attributes, but not inherent content or context, of computer-generated (target) objects. *See* Col. 1, lines 34-37. Fitzpatrick indicates that if the target and source objects are word process text, the transfer alters graphical attributes of the target object (font, emphasis, etc.) to those contained by the source object, without modifying the substantive context of either object. If the target and source objects are graphic objects, a similar transfer of graphical attributes (line thickness, background, colors, etc.) occurs without change to substantive context. *See* Col. 3, lines 46-52. Thus, Fitzpatrick discusses propagating graphical attributes. Fitzpatrick is silent about *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, as present in claim 1.

Budinsky fails at curing the shortcomings of Fitzpatrick with respect to disclosing or teaching *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*. Budinsky generally discusses automatic and user guided rule-based matching and reconciliation for integrating one or more entities. *See* Col. 2, lines 56-59. Budinsky further indicates that the matching/reconciliation rules are stored such that they can be recalled and applied during a subsequent editing session when the input entities change or a new composite entity of the inputs is desired. *See* Col. 2, lines 59-63. Nowhere does Budinsky disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above §103 rejection of claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, 8-13 and 23 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 9-13 and 23 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 3, 4, 9-13 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 24-29 and 34-39

In the Office Action, claims 24-29 and 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 27, 28 and 35 have been canceled. Therefore, the above § 103 rejection of claims 27, 28 and 35 is moot.

Claims 24, 25 and 26 recite *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter* which, as noted above, is not disclosed or suggested by either Fitzpatrick or Budinsky.

Claim 29 depends from claim 26 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 26. As discussed above with respect to claim 26, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky do not disclose or suggest at least *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is also present in claim 29. Therefore, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 29.

Claims 34, 36, 37, 38 and 39 recite features that are similar to features in claim 1. For example, claim 34 recites *selecting at least one characteristic of a source graphical object in a Unified Modeling Language (UML) diagram*, claim 36 recites *selecting at least one characteristic of a source component in a circuit diagram*, claim 37 recites *selecting at least one characteristic of a source component in a mechanical diagram*, claim 38 recites *selecting at least one characteristic of a source graphical element in a biological diagram* and claim 39 recites *selecting at least one characteristic of a source graphical element in network diagram*.

Claims 34, 36, 37, 38 and 39 further recite *said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter* which, as noted above, is not disclosed or suggested by either Fitzpatrick or Budinsky.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 24, 25, 26, 29, 34, 36, 37, 38 and 39. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 24, 25, 26, 29, 34, 36, 37, 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

C. Claims 7 and 21

In the Office Action, claims 7 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of Iriuchijima. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 7 and 21 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. As discussed above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 7 and 21. In addition, Iriuchijima fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

Iriuchijima discusses an object-oriented programming system which performs equivalent conversion on a class network structure (Abstract). Iriuchijima indicates accepting a range and a mode of equivalent conversion and, based on the range and the mode that were accepted, performing the equivalent conversion on program data representing the contents of a program containing classes (Col. 2, lines 56-60).

Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Iriuchijima, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional*

attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter, which is present in claims 7 and 21.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 7 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

D. Claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22

In the Office Action, claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of Dhond. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. As noted above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22. Dhond fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

Dhond discusses editing and archiving attribute values of the graphical objects; changing the attributes of individual graphical objects displayed in the log graphics presentation; selectively updating the attributes of associated graphical objects; automatically applying the changed attribute values to all the selected graphical objects within the presentation editor display; and archiving the graphical objects and their attributes to create new log graphic presentations or to add to other log graphic presentations, (Abstract).

Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Dhond, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 6, 16-17 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

E. Claims 14 and 15

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Budinsky and in further view of Shudo. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. As discussed above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 14 and 15. Shudo fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

Shudo discusses an information processor which stores and manages objects with attribute information added to the objects. When an object is selected, the attribute information of the object is stored in a storage medium. In response to a command issued for copying the selected attribute information, the attribute information stored in the storage medium is added to another object. The same attribute information can be added to a different object, (Abstract).

Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Shudo, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 14 and 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

F. Claims 40 and 41

In the Office Action, claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Zink and in further view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 41 depends from claim 40 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 40. Claim 40 recites *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter* which, as noted above, is not disclosed or suggested by either Fitzpatrick or Budinsky. Zink fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

Zink discusses a graphical solutions development system using placement of blocks representing hardware/software functionality on a computer screen drawing and connecting the blocks by wires representing data and control flow to create application programs and/or hardware design. The blocks are instances of development components that include intelligence for optimization within a detected environment, (Abstract).

Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Zink, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 40 and 41.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

G. Claims 42-44

In the Office Action, claims 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 43-44 depend from claim 42 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 42. As noted above, Fitzpatrick and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claim 42. Wold fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

Wold discusses an apparatus and method for interconnecting a plurality of independent software modules by means of specially configured software objects called "Input" and "Output." The software objects of Wold are implemented through library functions which include functions for making an Output object, making an Input object, adding actions to Input objects, making connections between the Input and Output objects of various software modules, sending messages from one software module to another, and receiving messages sent by another software module. Wold further indicates that a user can create, destroy, inspect and/or hide connections between software modules, and display data flow between modules, (Abstract).

Fitzpatrick, Budinsky and Wold, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 42-44.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

H. Claim 45

In the Office Action, claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of Santori. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 45 depends from claim 42 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 42. As noted above, Wold and Fitzpatrick, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claim 45. Santori fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

Santori discusses a first graphical program modeling a product being designed and a second graphical program performing a measurement function. The first graphical program may be deployed on a target device for execution. The target device may be coupled to a physical

system. The first graphical program may be executed on the target device to simulate operation of the product. The second graphical program may be executed to measure characteristics of the operation of the physical system and/or characteristics of the operation of the product, (Abstract).

Fitzpatrick, Wold and Santori, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claim 45.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

I. Claim 46

In the Office Action, claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Wold and in further view of Singh. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 46 depends from claim 42 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 42. As noted above, Wold and Fitzpatrick, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claim 42. Likewise, Singh does not disclose or suggest this claim feature.

Singh discusses an interface for enabling changes to parameter values of at least one of the graphical blocks to be made by and accepted from the user. The changes are applied to the graphical class instance to produce a graphical class instance that inherits structure from the library graphical class, (Abstract).

Fitzpatrick, Wold and Singh, taken either taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional*

attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter, which is present in claim 46.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

J. Claims 47 and 48

In the Office Action, claims 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloushev in view of Budinsky. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 48 depends from claim 47 and, as such, incorporates each and every feature of claim 47. As noted above, Budinsky does not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 47 and 48. Miloushev fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

As noted above, Budinsky does not disclose or suggest *selecting at least one characteristic of a source block in a block diagram, said selected at least one characteristic being at least one of a functional attribute, a compiled attribute, an execution data field, a block method or a block parameter*, which is present in claims 47 and 48. Miloushev fails to disclose or suggest at least this feature of claims 47 and 48.

Miloushev describes a system of reusable software parts for designing and constructing software components, applications and systems by assembly. Miloushev's system includes a dynamic container for software parts which supports integration of dynamically changing sets of parts into statically defined structures of parts, (Abstract).

For the reasons set forth above, Miloushev and Budinsky, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 47-48. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above rejection of claims 47-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-033RCE. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: April 28, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

By___/Neslihan I. Doran/___
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: L0389
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant